i	1		·
	Case 1:21-cv-00628-HBK Document	18 Filed 09/30/21 Page 1 of 2	
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	IVAN VON STAICH,	Case No. 1:21-cv-00628-HBK	
12	Petitioner,	ORDER DENYING PETITIONE FOR DEFAULT	ER'S MOTION
13	V.	(Doc. No. 10)	
14	U.S. PAROLE COMMISSION,	ORDER DIRECTING PETITION	
15 16	Respondent.	RESPONSE TO RESPONDENT TO DISMISS	'S MOTION
17		(Doc. No. 15)	
18		FOURTEEN-DAY DEADLINE	
19			
20			
21	Petitioner Ivan Von Staich initiated th	」 is action by filing a <i>pro se</i> petition for	writ of
22	mandamus under 28 U.S.C. § 1651. (Doc. No. 1). On April 16, 2021, the Court ordered		
23	Respondent to respond to the petition and directed the Clerk of Court to serve this order on the		
24	U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of California and the U.S. Parole Commissioner. (Doc. No.		
25	7). Inadvertently, neither of these entities were properly served. On July 26, 2021, in light of the		
26	fact that Respondent had not yet responded to the petition, Petitioner moved for default. (Doc.		
27	No. 10). On July 27, 2021, the Court served Respondent at the proper address. (See Doc. No. 12		
28			
	1		l l

## Case 1:21-cv-00628-HBK Document 18 Filed 09/30/21 Page 2 of 2

at 2, 12-1 at 2-7). On August 2, 2021, Respondent moved for and was granted a 45-day extension of time to respond to the petition, a Court order, and Petitioner's motion for default. (Doc. No. 12, 13). On September 16, 2021, Respondent timely responded to the petition, Court order, and Petitioner's motion for default. (Doc. No. 15). Respondent seeks dismissal of the petition. (*Id*). Entry of default is appropriate as to any party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought that has failed to plead or otherwise defend as provided by the Federal Rules of

relief is sought that has failed to plead or otherwise defend as provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and where that failure is shown by affidavit or otherwise. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(a). Here, Respondent was not initially properly served. After proper service, Respondent responded in a timely manner. Therefore, Respondent has not failed to plead or otherwise defend in this action. Accordingly, Petitioner's motion for default is denied. The Court will afford Petitioner an opportunity to respond to Respondent's motion to dismiss the petition.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

September 29, 2021

- 1. Petitioner's motion for default (Doc. No. 10) is DENIED.
- 2. Petitioner may file a response, if any, to Respondent's motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 15) within **fourteen (14) days** of receipt of this Order, after which time the Court will deem the motion ripe for review.

Dated:

HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE